



ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT

Master Minute Order

File Number: 21-382

Report ID: 21-382

Type: Regular - Planning

Status: Received

Agenda
Section:

Meeting Body: Board of Directors -
Regular Meeting

Report Created: 07/22/2021

Final Action: 09/08/2021

ded Action: Consider receiving an update on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Mobility Hub Pilot Program and the Oakland Mobility Transportation Demand Management Program. [Requested by Director Shaw - 4/14/2021 and 5/12/2021]

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: STAFF REPORT

Enactment Number:

Hearing Date:

Effective Date:

History of Legislative File

Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
Board of Directors - Regular Meeting	09/08/2021	Received				Pass
Action Text: MOTION: SHAW/WALSH to receive an update on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Mobility Hub Pilot Program and the Oakland Mobility Transportation Demand Management Program. The motion carried by the following vote:						
Notes: Director of Service Development and Planning Robert del Rosario presented the staff report.						
Public Comment:						
Katy Scott-Smith , PTA-EBDSA, expressed concern with some of the companies associated with the reported mobility programs and advocated for scrutiny when reviewing possible partnerships with private transportation companies. It was also suggested that bike storage/racks be made available to address the issue of first mile/last mile.						
Adina Levin commented on the importance of selecting a mobility program that most benefits riders and that regional investment include provisions for the creation of union jobs. Levin also encouraged the Board to watch what the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is doing in terms of open payment with Clipper 2.						
Board Discussion:						
Director Williams asked how labor may be impacted, infrastructure costs and also						

expressed concern with the lack of hubs in Ward 4. Mr. del Rosario advised that MTC was still trying to gauge the impact of the pilot program on transit operators, cities and private transportation companies, adding that the dollars that are available were for infrastructure and not intended to subsidize private transit operators. Mr. del Rosario also expressed staff's surprise with the lack of pilot locations throughout the service area and in Central Alameda County and would lobby MTC to add more locations. Director Williams volunteered to work with staff to extend the pilot into Castro Valley and Hayward.

Director Shaw commented that she was disappointed that BART was not more supportive of mobility hubs but added that her biggest concern was AC Transit being ready and prepared when the opportunity presented itself in the future. She added that this issue was about making the rider experience better and easier and that cities needed to be the ones to drive the effort and that additional conversations needed to be had with BART. Director Shaw offered that South Alameda County is open to the idea.

Director Shaw commented on the Oakland project near the Tempo line and asked how AC Transit is partnering with the City of Oakland to provide data on how many AC Transit passes are purchased with the debit cards and how many rides occur as a result in order to determine the pilot's success. Mr. del Rosario believed that staff could obtain the data on the transit pass purchases and would coordinate with the City with respect to usage data. Director Shaw advised that she would like to see the City's metrics and believed it would help gauge the success of the pilot. Director Shaw also felt it made sense to construct a mobility hub in the Fruitvale area near the Tempo service.

Director Beckles commented that there are many scooter and bike share organizations near several AC Transit bus stops and wanted to know how mobility hubs are different. Mr. del Rosario advised that mobility hubs help to better organize mobility connections in terms of wayfinding, ticket purchases and how to get to other modes of transportation. He added that mobility hubs provide a much better approach to transit over the current circumstances. Director Beckles commented on the downside of public/private partnerships and asked what a partnership with a private transportation company might look like in the future and how can we ensure that we are entering into partnerships with companies that aren't going to go out of business. Mr. del Rosario responded that while staff has no intention of entering into any partnerships at this point, other transit agencies have done so to promote micro mobility or complementary services at a discount. He went on to say that first and last mile is an issue that could be addressed through these partnerships but noted that it was difficult to predict which companies would be bought out by larger companies in the marketplace.

Director Walsh encouraged the idea of mobility hubs and wanted the Board to have a larger discussion about it to see how the rider experience can be improved regardless of the labor issues, perceived competition, or dynamics of the micro

mobility industry. She also expressed disappointment that AC Transit did not apply for any of the grants.

On the issue of public/private partnerships, President Ortiz asked if it was being suggested that AC Transit enter into contracts with private companies, expressing a concern with interaction of represented and non-represented employees in each agency. Mr. del Rosario explained that partnerships could come in the form of infrastructure or micro mobility for first and last mile trips. He added that it can also be in the form of discounts between transit modes.

Ayes: 7 President Ortiz, Vice President Young, Director Walsh, Director Beckles,
Director Williams, Director Shaw, Director Peeples
